

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are all the claims pending in the application.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the Information Disclosure Statement filed May 30, 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner rejected claim 8 under § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Examiner indicates that claim 8 recites that the instructions cause functionality when executed by a computer, but the claim fails to state that the instructions are stored as a part of a statutory machine.

Applicants submit that the present amendments to claim 8 obviate this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 under § 102(e) as being anticipated by Suzuki et al. (US 6,477,589). Applicants respectfully traversing this rejection as follows.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “An information processing apparatus connected to first information processing means via a bus of a single system, both the bus and said first information processing means being provided outside the information processing apparatus;” and “another inputting terminal directly connected to second information processing means, wherein said second information processing means does not conform to the standard that the bus is based on and is provided outside the information processing apparatus.”

The Examiner contends that the connection between the 1394 interface and controller 12 described in FIG. 22 of Suzuki et al. corresponds to the recited “another inputting terminal.”

Additionally, the Examiner contends that the controller 12 corresponds to the recited “second information processing means.” However, because the recited “bus” is “provided outside the information processing apparatus,” this is an external bus which lies outside the information processing apparatus. To the contrary, the 1394 interface and the controller 12 of Suzuki are internal to the image processing apparatus of Suzuki (*see* Suzuki, FIG. 22). In particular, FIG. 22 depicts an image processing apparatus, which includes both the controller 12 and the 1394 interface (bus) internal to the apparatus.

Thus, because Suzuki fails to disclose either a bus, first information processing means or second information processing means outside the information processing apparatus, Applicants submit that Suzuki fails to disclose every feature as recited and arranged in independent claim 1. Additionally, Applicants submit that claims 2-6 are allowable, at least because of their dependency.

With regard to claims 7 and 8, because these claims recited features similar to those argued above with regard to claim 1, we propose to submit that these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Conclusion


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Appln. No. 10/666,524

Atty. Dkt. No. Q77601

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


David P. Emery
Registration No. 55,454

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 24, 2007